July 21, 1967

Ronald Rees
3163 Colby ave
Los Angeles, Calif 90066

Mr. Weisberg:

I've just finished reading Whitewash II. I had previously read Whitewash I, and before that Inquest and Rush to Judgement. I have also read the paperback Warren Report for 95¢ and the paperback book, The Witnesses: Their Testimony, which just about covers the believable book circles not to mention NBC's branding of Jim Garrison and CBS's bum post series on the Report. You no doubt have seen these. I wrote to you as a laymen, looking up at the battle between pro-Report v. anti-Report. But am I confused? Simply: yes. I don't know who or what to believe. Not being an expert in researching as you are (as you must be by reading your books or you are a good faker), I don't know what to look at, where, or how to follow your refernces to the Report, or for that matter, Jane's or Epstein's. I can only believe if I work what you said in your conclusions in W.W. # 2, that nothing is taken out of context, it isn't fair as you put it. (Pg 378, # 3) I might come to the point right away. Jane (especially Jane) and Epstein have been accused of quoting out of context by news media; members Liebler, Ball, McCloy etc not to mention others. I believed they were doing the right job, truthful etc but they were not. A new book out by Schiler and Lewis called "The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report. They bring forth misquoted, out of

context examples of Jane's book and lectures. They even accuse you of taking out of context from one part of the Report and putting it next to another sentence in another part of the report. This had to do with the FBI reconstruction. I am not sure of the exact example they gave for it was long ago. And their The Confusion Comes on. Believe you or them? You critiqued Jane and Epstein in your book. So that leaves you. It seems you don't get as much publicity as they (especially Jane). But I feel you are more sincere, or truthful. I saw your appearances on local channels KHJ where you were interviewed by Ted Meyers and KTTV where you were also on the N.Y. produced special; The Warren Report: a minority opinion. I am pretty well acquainted with your views. I believed you. But then Life (Nov 25, 1966) mag. review of the Zapruder film came out with this. They went through a brief summary of some of the books. examples: The Oswald Affair, Sauvage - "far fetched theories, Sauvage is small, facts are questionable." The Second Oswald, Richard Popkin; "strictly for detective story fans"; Rush To Judgement: (quote from Alexander Bickel.); "grab-bag of virtually all conceivable theories that offer an alternative to Commission findings. The book is wildly speculative... peripheral and indiscriminate.", Inquest: (in short they found it the most objective book of all but Epstein's speculations are open to question). Whitewash: "by Harold Weisberg, a writer who printed his book at his own expense, is a

broadside against almost every statement the Report makes. It has solid nuggets of criticism, but they're lost in a sea of irrelevancies."

The Jan. 14, 1967 edition of Post mag. is generally favorable to all critics and calls for an investigation by Congress. Well, by February I was pretty well set. By that I mean, I still doubted the Report. Then Garrison's debacle on NBC followed by CBS's complete agreement with the Report. CBS examined the Report, glossing over the paper bag Oswald used (or didn't ?). They had a reporter wrap a Mannlicher-Carcano in a bag, then walk in front of the camera (suppose to be Frazier) and see if you could see the 8" stick up above his shoulder. Walter Cronkite asked, "You yourself can judge if Buell Wesley Frazier mistook the sight of Oswald tucking the package under his arm, making Kennedy almost invisible." Which is like saying You don't really see a rifle there, do you ? Of course not. But I did. But what got me back to the Report side was when they said jerking motions could be seen on the Zapruder film which were determined to be Zapruder reacting to rifle shots. There was a jerk at frame 190, 220 (approx.) and 318 which would (because of an instant delayed reaction) mean shots at frames 186, 216 (approx) and 313. Frame 186 would be at bet between the branches of the oak tree, meaning a shot earlier than thought, along with the evidence the camera could have been working faster or slower, increasing the time span from 4 sec to about 8 sec., sufficient time ? Yes. Then I read

Whitewash II and there was the confusion again. are you right? Is CBS? who is? If Jane being a critic is criticized for misquotes, are you like [redacted]? Can I expect an answer because I (I cross out letter than names) have brought up instances of misquotes or out of context instances people have (Schiller and Lewis, libel accused you of committing. If you are the type I hope you are, I hope you'll tell me the correct and truthful answers because as I write this, I'm still in the middle looking out and I hope the major purpose of the writings, the assassination, will not be overshadowed by accusation v. accusation.

Sincerely,

Ronald Press